

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the present patent application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

In this Amendment claims 47-48 and 50 are amended, and claims 52-55 are added, and no claims are canceled (claims 31, 38, 40, 42 and 44 were previously canceled). As a result, claims 1-30, 32-37, 39, 41, 43 and 45-55 remain pending in the application.

In the non-final Office Action of January 9, 2008, claims 47, 48 and 50 are objected to in view of a typographical error ("in the in the"). Claims 1-10, 12-25, 27-30, 32-37 and 46-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of U.S. Patent 6,314,189 (Frederick), further in view of U.S. Patent 5,257,348 (Roskowski), yet further in view of U.S. Patent 5,287,189 (Ersoz) and yet even further in view of U.S. Patent 6,567,097 (Iwaki). Claims 11 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Frederick, further in view of Roskowski, yet further in view of Ersoz yet further in view of Iwaki, and yet even further in view of U.S. Patent 6,154,600 (Newman). Claims 39, 41, 43 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Frederick, further in view of Roskowski, yet further in view of Ersoz yet further in view of Iwaki, and yet even further in view of U.S. Patent 6,072,489 (Gough).

Claim Objection

This paper includes amendments to attend to a typographical error in claims 47-48 and 50. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

§103 Rejection of Claims 47-48 and 50

The §103 rejection of dependent claims 47-48 and 50 in view of the hypothetical combination of Frederick, Roskowski, Ersoz and Iwaki is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claims 47-48 and 50, added by the previous amendment of October 24, 2007, describe the embodiment depicted in Figure 6. The second connector coupled to the video capture circuitry recited in these claims is shown as the connector between Display 114 and ADC 226. The Office Action contends that Frederick teaches the features of claims 47-48 and 50, pointing to col. 5, lines 18-25.¹ The Office Action states that the “combination of Frederick’s, Roskowski’s, and Ersoz’s systems teaches the second connector is configured to send the television compatible signal from the display apparatus to the video capture circuitry in the noninterlaced mode.” After a careful review of the cited portion of Frederick, as well as the Frederick, Roskowski, Ersoz and Iwaki patents taken in their entirety, this contention is respectfully traversed. The cited portion of Frederick reads:

The interconnectivity between the PC Theatre system PC 14 and the display 12 will now be described in greater detail. This interconnectivity is defined using existing VESA and USB standards as building blocks to support identification of the display 12 by the PC 14, bi-directional communication, display control by the PC, sharing of the display's resources by the PC 14, and transport of audio and video between the display 12 and PC 14.²

This passage simply mentions that there is bi-directional communication between PC 14 and the display 12 and that the interconnectivity is defined using the VESA and USB standards. No further details or explanation could be found in Frederick for features of claims 47-48 and 50. Figure 8 of Frederick shows the interconnection between PC 14 and display 12. However, the

¹ Office Action of January 9, 2008, page 11.

² Frederick, col. 5, lines 18-25.

connectors recited in the claims are not shown in this figure. The interconnection between PC 14 and display 12 is discussed in the following passage of Frederick:

The display 12 supports the video electronics of a standard monitor. The display 12 receives either analog RGB video or digital TMDS video through the appropriate P&D connector 32 or 34 and displays the video according to the user settings.³

It is not understood how this passage of Frederick, or any other passage of Frederick, taken in view of the other cited documents, would not lead one to interconnect the Frederick in the manner recited in claims 47-48 and 50. **In the event the rejection is maintained, it is respectfully requested that the next paper more fully explain what portions of Frederick, Roskowski and Ersoz either teach or suggest the features of claims 47-48 and 50.**

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Frederick, Roskowski and Ersoz patents, either taken singly or in hypothetical combination, do not teach the features of the claimed invention in claims 47-48 and 50. Therefore, withdrawal of the §103 rejection applied to these claims is respectfully requested.

Frederick / Roskowski / Ersoz / Iwaki / Newman §103 Rejection

The §103 rejection of claims 1-10, 12-25, 27-30, 32-37 and 46-51 in view of the hypothetical combination of Frederick, Roskowski, Ersoz and Iwaki, and the §103 rejection of claims 11 and 26 additionally in view of Newman are respectfully traversed, for at least the following reasons.

Regarding the microprocessor recited in claims 1, 13 and 34, it is agreed that the control electronics 82 of Frederick may be construed to encompass various “microprocessor” equivalents

such as the microcontroller or logic circuitry of Frederick. However, it is believed that Frederick does not teach or suggest all the specific features recited in the microprocessor claim elements. For example, there is nothing that would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Frederick display device to be capable of “controlling a television feature of the display apparatus from the host computer system when said screen is operating in said interlaced format, and for enabling an overlay window” as recited in claim 34. Moreover, no particular display screen of Frederick is capable of both displaying interlaced images and also displaying noninterlaced images.

The Office’s contention that a number of claim elements would be inherent in the Frederick device is again respectfully traversed (e.g., inherency allegations for a processor, a memory coupled to the processor, a video controller coupled to the memory and the processor, a display controller, and a display screen). Rather than again repeat the explanation of these inherency traversals, the applicable text is hereby incorporated by reference from the previous response filed October 27, 2007.

The Office Action again contends that Frederick teaches a display screen in accordance with the present invention. The pending claims include a “screen operable to display visually detectable output from the host computer system when operating in the noninterlaced mode of operation **and** operable to display the converted television output in an overlay window while said visually detectable output from the host computer system is being displayed in the noninterlaced mode of operation,” as recited in claim 34 (with similar features recited in claims 1 and 13; emphasis added), and the feature of a “display apparatus comprising circuitry providing a

³ Frederick, col. 18, lines 3-7.

first mode of operation which is an interlaced mode of operation and a second mode of operation which is a noninterlaced mode of operation” as recited in claim 29. Again, it is respectfully submitted that the Office Action’s contention that Frederick includes these features cannot properly be maintained. Frederick is silent as to whether its system supports both an interlaced mode and a non-interlaced mode, but does mention using either an analog display or else a digital display—presumably different displays. Hence, Frederick system can operate either with an analog display, or else with a digital display. Frederick does not teach or suggest a single display having both modes of operation (or display circuitry). Moreover, as mentioned in the previous response, the Frederick patent appears to teach away from this feature, stating that the signals for the display are different depending upon the type of display. Hence, the Frederick patent does not teach the features mentioned above pertaining to a noninterlaced mode and an interlaced mode.

The third cited document in the rejection to Ersoz mentions various aspects of interlaced signals and non-interlaced signals. However, for the same reasons set forth above, it would be improper to combine Ersoz with the Frederick because doing so would make Frederick unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. The fourth cited patent to Iwaki pertains generally to a display control apparatus. Iwaki does not overcome the aforementioned deficiencies of Frederick and Roskowski. The Newman patent involves a media editor system. This patent is cited by the Office because it mentions a parallel port, a feature of the claims. Newman does not overcome the aforementioned deficiencies of Frederick and Roskowski.

For at least these reasons, the hypothetical combination of Frederick, Roskowski, Ersoz and Iwaki (and the Newman for claims 11 and 26) does not teach or suggest teaches a “screen

operable to display visually detectable output from the host computer system when operating in the noninterlaced mode of operation and operable to display a television compatible signal when operating in the interlaced mode of operation” as recited in claim 1, or the similar features recited in claims 13 and 34. The hypothetical combination proposed by the Office also does not teach or suggest the feature of a “display apparatus comprising circuitry providing a first mode of operation which is an interlaced mode of operation and a second mode of operation which is a noninterlaced mode of operation” as recited in claim 29.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Frederick, Roskowski, Ersoz, Iwaki and Newman patents, either taken singly or in hypothetical combination, do not teach the features of the claimed invention. Therefore, withdrawal of the §103 rejection applied to claims 1-11, 12-26, 27-30 and 32-37 is respectfully requested.

Newly Added Claims

New claim 52 recites a display apparatus “configured to receive signals from the host computer for controlling the screen when operating in the interlaced mode of operation.” Claims 53 and 55 recite similar features. New claim 54 recites “sending signals from the computer system to control the display apparatus when operating in the interlaced mode of operation.” Support for the newly added claims can be found throughout the specification, for example, at lines 22-27 of page 14 in the specification. It is believed that the prior art does not teach or suggest these features, taken in view of the claims from which they depend.

Deposit Account Authorization / Provisional Time Extension Petition

It is believed that no extension of time is needed for this paper, and the accompanying Fee Transmittal attends to the required claim fees. However, to the extent necessary, a provisional petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 50-0439 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. However, in the event there are any unresolved issues, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact applicant's representative, Scott Richardson, by telephone at (571) 970-6835 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott Charles Richardson
Reg. No. 43,436

The Brevetto Law Group, PLLC
107 S. West Street, #765
Alexandria, VA 22314

Date: March 13, 2008